

**REMARKS**

This patent application presently includes Claims 5-8, of which Claim 6 is allowed and Claims 5, 7 and 8 are rejected. Claim 5 is amended to define the applicants' invention more clearly, and all rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 8 were rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112. The examiner was of the opinion that the use of the word "types" in Line 3 of Claim 5 rendered it indefinite. This word has now been deleted, so this rejection should be withdrawn. Claim 8 was rejected only owing to its dependence from Claim 5, so the rejection should also be withdrawn with respect to Claim 8.

Claims 5 and 8 were rejected as obvious over Younan et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,575,861 in view of Tennant, U.S. Patent No. 4,321,416 and JP 11-195803. This rejection is respectfully traversed. None of these references, nor their combinations renders these claims obvious.

As presently amended, the step for preparing a plurality of solar cell modules is broken down into four separate sub-steps. It is not seen that any of the cited references or their combination teach or suggest these four sub-steps. Claim 8 is allowable based upon its dependence from Claim 5.

Claim 5 was rejected as obvious over Dillard, U.S. Patent No. 5,928,437 in view of Tennant. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither reference, nor their combination renders this claim obvious.

As explained above, Claim 5 now includes four sub-steps which define the steps for preparing a plurality of solar cell modules. These steps are not taught by either reference, nor would their combination suggest these four steps. Accordingly, Claim 5 is believed to be allowable.

The examiner stated that the terms "sub-module" and "power generating region" were not given any patentable weight. It is believed that in the context of the new sub-steps these terms are given specific meanings which must be taken into consideration. When that is done, it is clear that the references do not teach or suggest the sub-steps.

Claim 7 was rejected as obvious over the admissions of prior art within the present application in view of JP-10-082152. This rejection is respectfully traversed. JP '152 does not disclose what the examiner suggests, and the combination he suggests would not lead to the claimed subject matter.

Inherent in the examiner's rejection is that JP '152 provides some suggestion that the wiring members which electrically connect the solar cells modules be sealed in a resin. This is decidedly not the case, because JP '152 specifically teaches that the wiring members be in a terminal box, so there would be no reason to have the resin. Moreover, the structure utilized in JP '152 is entirely different from the prior art disclosed, for example, in Fig. 4 of the present patent application, and there is no reason to be believed that those skilled in the art would have any reason to look for a usual feature in the different type of device disclosed in JP '152.

Furthermore, as may be seen in Fig. 12 of the present patent application, the wiring member 36 is sealed in resin between the base 31 and the base 37b, and the resin material bonds to the two bases. Claim 7 has been amended to clearly define this feature. At the same time, this feature is not taught or suggested either in the admitted prior art or in JP '152. Accordingly, Claim 7 is believed to be allowable.

Applicant's attorney has made every effort to place this patent application in condition for allowance. It is therefore earnestly requested that this application, as a whole, receive favorable reconsideration and that all of the claims be allowed as presently constituted. Should there remain any unanswered questions, the examiner is requested to call the applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number given below.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Joseph B. Lerch

Registration No.: 26,936

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant